

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 14-20 have been examined and are rejected. Specifically, claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), or alternatively 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,987,336 to Sudo et al. (hereinafter “Sudo”). Claims 14-17 and 19-20¹ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,128,475 to Wicks et al. (hereinafter “Wicks”) in view of European Patent Publication No. 0602840 to Haas (hereinafter “Haas”) and Sudo. Additionally, claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs.

By way of overview, Applicant overcomes these grounds of rejection as follows.

II. Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) / § 102(e)

As noted above, claim 20 stands rejected § 102(b), or alternatively § 102(e), as allegedly being anticipated by Sudo.

Applicant amends claim 20 to recite, *inter alia*, “selecting one of the information items as a first information item.” Claim 20 is also amended to recite that “pressing the movement key in a first direction selects a first information item displayed in a row immediately preceding the row of the first information item; pressing the movement key in a second direction selects a second information item displayed in a column immediately following the column of the first

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 09/965,889
Attorney Docket No. Q66258

information item; pressing the movement key in a third direction selects a third information item displayed in a row immediately following the row of the first information item; and pressing the movement key in a fourth direction selects a fourth information item displayed in a column immediately preceding the column of the first information item.”

It is respectfully submitted that Sudo fails to disclose or suggest these features of amended claim 20. Therefore, claim 20 is not anticipated by Sudo.

III. Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 14-20 stand rejected under § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wicks in view of Haas and Sudo.

As noted above, Sudo fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 20, as amended. Wicks and Haas (alone or in combination) fail to make up for these deficiencies of Sudo. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 20, as amended, is patentable over the Examiner’s proposed combination of Wicks, Haas and Sudo.

Similar to claim 20, Applicant amends claim 14 to recite, *inter alia*, that “one of the information items is initially selected as a first information item” and “the selection key pad comprises a first key, a second key, a third key and a fourth key.” Claim 14 is also amended to recite that “pressing the first key selects a first information item displayed in a row immediately preceding the row of the first information item; pressing the second key selects a second

¹ From the context of the Office Action (*see* pages 5 and 6), it appears that the Examiner meant to reject claim 18 under § 103(a) as well.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 09/965,889
Attorney Docket No. Q66258

information item displayed in a column immediately following the column of the first information item; pressing the third key selects a third information item displayed in a row immediately following the row of the first information item; and pressing the fourth key selects a fourth information item displayed in a column immediately preceding the column of the first information item.”

Wicks, Haas and Sudo (alone or in combination) fail to teach or suggest all of these features of claim 14. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 14, as amended, is patentable over the Examiner’s proposed combination of Wicks, Haas and Sudo. Consequently, claims 15-19 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

IV. Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 112, First and Second Paragraphs

Claim 18 stands rejected under § 112, first and second paragraphs. In particular, the Examiner’s position is that the features of claim 18 contradict the features recited in claim 14, from which claim 18 depends. Applicant amends claim 18 into independent form and to further clarify the operation of the recited single lever-type key. It is respectfully submitted that claim 18, as amended, is in compliance with the requirements of § 112, first and second paragraphs (*see, e.g.*, Applicant’s Fig. 7). Therefore, the Examiner is requested to withdraw the § 112, first and second paragraph, rejections of claim 18.

V. New Claims 21-30

Applicant adds new claims 21-30 to obtain an expanded scope of protection. Claims 21-25 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 09/965,889
Attorney Docket No. Q66258

Claim 26 is patentable based on a rationale analogous to that for claim 14. Consequently, claims 27-30 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Billy Carter Raulerson
Registration No. 52,156

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 26, 2004